

## **REMARKS**

This is a Response to the Advisory Action mailed January 3, 2007. The Applicant originally submitted claims 1 - 41 in this application. Claims 1 - 9, 12 - 27, and 31 - 36 remain pending in this application. Claims 2, 4, 9, 12 - 19, 23, 25, 26, 31, and 32 have been amended by this amendment. New claims 42 - 44 have been added by this amendment. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

The Examiner has allowed claims 19 - 27 and 33 - 36. The Examiner has objected to claims 7 - 9, 11 - 13, 15 - 18 and 29 - 31 as containing allowable subject matter, but depending from rejected base claims. The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for recognizing the allowable subject matter of these claims.

New claim 42 corresponds to claim 1, but with the allowable subject matter of claim 7 and intervening claim 5 incorporated therein. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner did not enter the amendments filed after final on December 7, 2006 and December 12, 2006. In paragraph 11 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner stated that the subject matter of claim 5 was only incorporated into the preamble of new claim 42. The Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of claim 5 has now been incorporated into the body of the claim. Accordingly, claim 42 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 2 and 4 have been amended to change their dependencies to make them depend directly or indirectly from new claim 42. Claim 3 has been cancelled.

New claim 43 corresponds to claim 10, but with the allowable subject matter of claim 11 incorporated therein. In paragraph 11 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner stated that only a portion of the subject matter of claim 11 has been incorporated into claim 43. The Applicant respectfully disagrees, and fails to see what part of claim 11 was not incorporated into new claim 43. The Applicant believes that claim 43 is in condition for allowance. Claims 12 - 14 have been amended to change their dependencies to make them depend directly from new claim 43.

Claim 44 corresponds to claim 28, but with the allowable subject matter of claim 29 incorporated therein. In paragraph 11 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner stated that

only a portion of the subject matter of claim 29 has been incorporated into claim 44. The Examiner is correct. The Applicant determined that claim 44 would be more accurate if it recited "phase-locking the multi-phase clock signal generator in accordance with the first phase error indication" rather than "phase-locking the multi-phase clock signal generator in accordance with the first, second and third phase error indications". Only one of the phase error indications is typically used to phase-lock the clock signal generator. The Applicant respectfully submits that claim 44 is in condition for allowance. Claims 31 and 32 have been amended to change their dependencies to make them depend directly from new claim 44. Claim 30 has been cancelled.

In paragraph 11 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner referred to several other issues such as antecedent basis and claim consistency issues. The claims have been amended to address these issues. With respect to the Examiner's statement that the term "local" should be replaced with the term "remote" in claims 22 and 25, the Applicant respectfully submits that the use of the term "local" is correct in claims 22 and 25. These claims are intended to cover the cases where a local receiver samples the data signal output by the local transmitter, as exemplified in FIGs. 3C and 3D of the present application.

***Rejection Of Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 37 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)***

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jinbo et al. (US Patent No. 6,438,081) in view of Robinson et al. (US Patent No. 6,624,668). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Nevertheless, this rejection is deemed moot in view of the aforementioned claim amendments. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above comments, the Applicants respectfully submit that all grounds of rejection are overcome and that the application is in full condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicants earnestly solicit early and favorable action. Should there be any further questions or reservations, the Examiner is urged to telephone the Applicants' undersigned attorney at (770) 984-2300.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel J. Santos/

Daniel J. Santos, Reg. No. 40,158

GARDNER GROFF SANTOS & GREENWALD, P.C.  
2018 Powers Ferry Road, Suite 800  
Atlanta, GA 30329  
Tel: 770/984-2300  
Fax: 770/984-0098